DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 677 EA 012 611

AUTHOR	Pelavin, Diane: And Others
TITLE	An Analysis of the Achievements and Impacts of the Fund's Projects.
INSTITUTION	NTS Research Corp., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 80
CONTRACT	100-80-0128
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980). For related documents, see EA 012 610 and EA 012 612.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; *Educational Innovation; Equal Education; *Federal Programs; *Information Dissemination; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education

ABSTRACT

An important indicator of the success of a funding agency is the achievement and impact of the projects it supports. This paper, one of three related documents, examines the effectiveness of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, a fund to improve educational opportunities. A telephone survey was conducted in 1979 of all of the fund's grant recipients from 1973-78. More data were gathered from 50 case studies conducted of the fund's projects. Four areas of the projects were examined, including innovation, effect on host institution, influence on other organizations, and continuation after federal support was withdrawn. Some of the results showed (1) over three-quarters of the projects were innovative; (2) over 50 percent caused significant changes in the operation of their host institution; (3) dissemination activities of the projects were extensive; and (4) 70 percent of the projects met the necessary criteria to be considered institutionalized. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
Boston, Massachusetts
April 6-11, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED185677

EA 012 611

NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707
(919) 493-3451

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

DRAFT

An Analysis of the Achievements and Impacts of the Fund's Projects

Diane Pelavin, Dan Johnston, and
Jan Shefter

NTS Research Corporation
Durham, North Carolina

Presented at
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
April 1980
Boston, Massachusetts

Research reported in this paper was supported under Contract # HEW-100-80-0128 for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACTS OF PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (the Fund) is a small grant-awarding Federal agency which attempts to encourage improvements in postsecondary education by providing small seed-money grants to fledgling projects that focus on local needs. Since October 1978, NTS Research Corporation has been conducting a comprehensive evaluation of this agency for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW).

An important indicator of the success of a funding agency is achievements and impacts of the projects it has supported. This paper examines the achievements and impacts of the Fund's projects as they relate to four questions:

1. Were the projects innovative?
2. Did the projects affect their host institutions?
3. Did the projects influence other organizations? and
4. Were the project activities able to become institutionalized after Federal support was withdrawn?

Data for this paper were obtained from two sources. The primary source was a telephone survey conducted in May and June 1979 of all of the Fund's grant recipients from 1973 through 1978. The data collected in this survey included:

- Project operations and activities;
- Direct impacts of projects supported by the Fund;
- Dissemination and adaptation of project activities and impacts; and
- Project institutionalization.

The survey interviews contained 92 structured questions. Opportunities were also provided for the respondents to provide open responses. The average time for each interview was 45 minutes; therefore, to minimize respondent burden, no individual was interviewed more than once, although some respondents had received more than one grant from the Fund. Interviews were completed with 443 of the 486 grantees, for a response rate of 91 percent.

A secondary source of data was the 50 case studies conducted of the Fund's projects.[1] These case studies provided important qualitative information and served as a means of validating information obtained from the survey.

Project Innovation

Under the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-318, enacted June 23, 1972) the Fund was legislatively mandated to encourage improvement in postsecondary education. Furthermore, the task force which was responsible for the Fund's organization stressed that the agency should be risk-taking, accepting proposals for new and unproven ideas as well as proven ideas (Bunting, 1975). It follows, therefore, that the extent to which the Fund's projects have been innovative should be used as a measure of their achievements. This measure required a clear definition of the term "innovation."

To develop a definition of "innovation" which could be applied to the diverse project activities supported by the Fund, a number of issues had to be considered. First, to define an activity as innovative only if it were occurring for the first time was viewed as too strenuous a criterion. A new idea which has occurred only once might be viewed only as an anomaly rather than as an innovation having applicability to a substantial segment of the field. Our

[1] Case studies completed for this evaluation are published in Evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Volume I: Case Studies. NTS Research Corporation, Durham, N.C., 1979.

review of a sample of 3,000 proposals[2] to the Fund substantiated this view by showing that postsecondary organizations often develop an idea without any knowledge of its existence elsewhere.[3] Furthermore, to limit the definition of innovation to the occurrence of a new idea in a new context was considered too narrow a criterion. An idea representing a new direction within a particular context might also qualify as innovative. For example, the concept of a management training program is not, in itself, new. However, when a graduate school of business, in conjunction with several small women's liberal arts colleges, develops a summer management training internship program for women, the concept can be considered innovative. It is allowing an expansion of educational opportunity within a setting that would traditionally neglect such expansion either because such education is beyond the scope of "liberal arts" or because, individually, the institutions lack the financial and technical capacity to establish such a program.

Based on these issues, innovation has been defined, for purposes of the evaluation of the Fund, as an idea which, within its local setting, is new in terms of either its activities or the population it serves. Based on this definition, the following two questions were included in the grantee survey:

- Did the idea for your project represent a departure from pre-existing activities of the organization? and
- Were the postsecondary education students or potential postsecondary students [served by your project] the typical clientele of the host institution?

Seventy-six percent of the Fund's projects were reported by their directors to be departures from pre-existing activities at the host institution. Additionally, 39 percent of all grantees reported serving a student clientele that

---

[2] A discussion of the document review task of the evaluation can be found in Chapters 3 and 4 of Pelavin, S., et al. An evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, (Volume II): Applicants and Grantees NTS Research Corporation, Durham, N.C., February 1980.

[3] This phenomenon is also frequently observed in scientific research.

was atypical of the students traditionally served by the host institution. Thus, at least three-quarters of the Fund's projects met the definition of innovation used in the evaluation. The activities pursued by these innovative projects included counseling, instructional improvement, individual assessment, and curriculum development. Table 1 presents the percent of innovative projects that have pursued each of these activities.

Project Effect Upon Host Institution

A measure of achievements and impacts was the projects' effects on their host institutions. Such effects would be the first expected indicator that project improvements and innovations were spreading into the field.

Two-thirds of the grantees reported that their projects contributed significantly to improving the climate for acceptance of innovation within their institutions.[4] Furthermore, over half of the grantees reported that their projects led to significant operational changes in their institutions[5] and that two-thirds of these changes went beyond the scope of the project as initially supported by the Fund.[6] Most impressive among the project impacts, however, was the fact that one-quarter of the grantees reported that their projects had changed the mission of their host institutions.[7]

The Fund's projects influenced the following six areas of their host institutions: responsiveness to individual needs, responsiveness to community needs, instructional quality, institutional access, financial health, and criteria for awarding credentials. Table 2 contains data which reflect the extent to which

---

[4] See Question 51 and its response frequency, Appendix A.

[5] See Question 52 and its response frequency, Appendix A.

[6] See Question 52A and its response frequency, Appendix A.

[7] See Question 42 and its response frequency, Appendix A.

Table 1

Profile of Activities of Innovative Projects

(n = 332)

Activities	Projects that pursued each activity[a]	
	n	%
Instruction	255	77
Curriculum	239	72
Faculty development	233	70
Individual assessment	227	69
Counseling	208	63
Recruitment or access	179	54
Organization, management improvement	176	53
Brokering	161	49
Competency-based education	145	44
Basic skills remediation	143	43

[a]Activities are not mutually exclusive; therefore these data reflect a duplicated count.

Table 2

Areas Within the Host Institution Which Grantees Reported

To Have Been Affected by the Fund's Projects

(n = 443)

Areas	# of projects[a]	% of projects[a]
Enhanced responsiveness to individual needs	189	43
Enhanced responsiveness to community needs	154	35
Improved instructional quality	148	33
Improved access to the institution	123	28
Improved financial health in the institution	93	21
Improved criteria for awarding postsecondary credentials	86	19

[a]Projects could affect more than one area of their host institution; therefore these data represent a duplicated count.

projects affected each of these six areas. Although all six areas were significantly improved, the Fund's projects had their strongest impacts on enhancing the institution's responsiveness to both individual needs and community needs and on improving instructional quality.

Project Influence on Other Organizations

A more stringent measure of the achievements and impacts of the projects is their influence on organizations beyond their host institutions. If projects are to exert such influence, their activities and accomplishments first must become widely known within the field of postsecondary education; hence dissemination of project information is a critical determinant of the accomplishments of the Fund's projects. Furthermore, the projects must not only become widely known but must affect the activities at other institutions; hence, a second critical factor is the extent of project impacts beyond the host institutions. Those two factors are investigated in the following section.

Dissemination

Information about the Fund's projects has been disseminated in numerous ways. The Fund itself distributes information about its current projects in its annual publication Resources for Change. Three thousand copies of the 1979 edition have been printed and distributed. The projects themselves, however, are the primary source of information. Eighty-seven percent of the Fund's projects were reported by project directors to have disseminated information about their project activities.[8]

Major dissemination activities included responses to telephone and mail inquiries, use of diffusion networks, presentation of professional papers, use

[8]See Question 54 and its response frequency, Appendix A.

of media resources, workshop participation, and site visits. Table 3 indicates the number of projects which have used each of these channels.

The major dissemination products of the projects included information on accomplishments, information or technical assistance regarding project implementation, prepackaged materials, and information intended to popularize the basic concept of the project. The number of projects involved in each of these activities is presented in Table 4. As these data show, the most frequently disseminated information concerns project accomplishments or impacts. In all, the projects responded to over 279,000[9] requests from institutions of postsecondary education. Requests were so extensive that over 20 percent of the projects were unable to fulfill all of the requests for dissemination services that they received, and almost 11,000 requests went unfilled. It should be noted that in over 80 percent of the projects involved in dissemination activities, these activities constituted less than one-quarter of the projects' time and budget. Thus, dissemination represents a significant project activity for a relatively small expenditure in time and resources.

The ETS Evaluation of Academically Creditable Competencies Acquired by Women in Domestic and Volunteer Work (Princeton, New Jersey) illustrates not only the intensity of the demand for information from the Fund's projects, but also the diversity of groups that feel they can utilize the same information. This project attempted to address the problems that women who are entering or reentering college have in translating the experience and skills gained in house and volunteer work into academic credit. Through development of a taxonomy of skills as well as the development and evaluation of assessment materials for analyzing competencies, the project was able to produce a user's manual to

---

[9]While this number was initially viewed as inordinately high, further investigation indicated that one project was responsible for 100,000 of the reported dissemination events. The project was operated by a library which provided information to many of the libraries throughout the country.

Table 3

Project Utilization of Dissemination Channels

(n = 376)

	# of projects	% of projects[a]
Telephone or mail response to inquiries	372	99
Sponsorship/participation in conferences/workshops	346	92
Site visits from interested organizations	328	88
Use of formal or informal diffusion networks	324	86
Publication/presentation of professional papers	276	73
Visits to interested organizations	264	70
Use of media resources	228	61

[a]Refers to percent of those projects having dissemination activities.

Table 4

Project Dissemination Activities

(n = 376)

Type of disseminated information	# of projects	% of projects[a]	% of all projects (n=443)
Project accomplishments/impacts	333	88	75
Information to popularize basic concept of project	303	81	68
Technical assistance/information regarding project implementation	302	80	68
Prepackaged materials	219	58	49

[a]Percent of those projects which disseminated information.

translate these life experiences into academically creditable competencies. This manual was intended primarily for use by women seeking to enter or return to college and, secondarily, by college counselors and admissions offices. However, the demand for the manual has come not only from these expected clients, but also from employers, curriculum designers, and even a state civil service commission. In 1978 alone, ETS received almost 5,000 requests for this manual. This dissmenination effort has reached a large and diverse clientele.

Impacts Beyond the Host Institution

One of the important findings of the evaluation was that the Fund's projects have affected not only their host institutions, but other institutions and organizations of postsecondary education. According to the grantee survey 70 percent of the Fund's projects led to impacts beyond the operations of the host institution.[10] The data contained in Table 5 indicate how frequently six general areas of postsecondary education have been affected by the Fund's projects. These data suggest that the effects are greatest on the individual areas of needs, access, but that effects on instructional quality are also important.

The results of the grantee survey also indicate that postsecondary institutions have been active in adapting or replicating the Fund's projects. According to data from the survey of grantees, approximately 14,000 postsecondary institutions or organizations have attempted to adapt aspects of the Fund's projects' activities, philosophies, or objectives. Moreover, this datum

[10] See Question 53 and its response frequency, Appendix A.

Table 5

General Areas of Postsecondary Education

Affected by the Fund's Projects

(n = 443)

Areas	# of projects[a]	% of projects[a]
Responsiveness of the postsecondary educational community to the individual needs of their current clientele	236	53
Responsiveness of postsecondary institutions to the needs of their host communities	192	43
Access to the postsecondary educational community	191	43
Instructional quality in postsecondary institutions	173	39
Criteria for awarding postsecondary credentials	97	22
Financial health of the postsecondary educational community	95	21

[a]Project could affect more than one area; therefore these data represent a duplicated count.

indicates that over 1,000 institutions have attempted to replicate the activities of a project that received the Fund's support.[11]

Project Continuation

The first three questions in this paper addressed the extent to which the Fund's projects effected change within and beyond their own institutions. The last question examines the permanence of these changes. A recent study of educational change agents (Berman, McLaughlin, 1978) found the frequency of project institutionalization to be very low in four large Federal seed money educational programs. Based on this finding institutionalization was judged to be the most stringent criterion against which to measure the impact of the Fund's projects.

From its beginning in 1973 through FY 79, the Fund has supported more than 500 projects. To determine what occurs after the Fund's support has ended, approximately 322 projects which were completed or about to be completed were investigated more extensively in the grantee survey to determine if they had become institutionalized. Fifty-one of these projects were specifically designed to accomplish a discrete task and then to terminate. The other 271 projects had the potential for continuation after the Fund's support had ended.

For purposes of this analysis, a project was considered to be institutionalized if it met all three of the following criteria:

1. it continued to exist after the Fund's support ended;
2. its activities or services were not substantially reduced; and

---

[11] A caveat must be interjected at this point. The last questions posed in the grantee survey were those asking about numbers and specific examples of adaptation and replication sites. Despite the placement of these questions in this lengthy survey, respondents listed a total of 168 supposed replication sites and over 1,000 (supposed) adaptation sites. All of the replication examples and 230 randomly selected adaptation examples have been subsequently included in the current phase of the evaluation of the Fund. Results of this phase are not yet in,

3. the project was optimistic about its prospects for long-term (five or more years) survival.

Seventy percent[12] of the 271 projects that had continuation potential met all three criteria; thus 70 percent of the projects that attempted to become institutionalized have actually succeeded. Among the projects that have been completed for at least two years, 55 percent have become institutionalized. While this figure is slightly lower than that for all completed projects, it is still substantially higher than the Berman and McLaughlin estimates of institutionalization among other educational change agents.

Not only are a substantial number of projects continuing to operate, but the data indicate that the impact of these projects often increases over time. Of those projects still in existence following the end of Federal support, over half have expanded their services and now serve more students. Moreover, 42 percent of institutionalized projects have increased their funding level. It should be noted that the increased funding level has occurred without the use of Federal funds. The Fund's support was almost never replaced with funds from another Federal agency, Rather, the new support came from the host institution, client fees or tuition, state or local funds, or foundation grants. It is evident that without any additional Federal funds, many of the Fund's projects are able not only to continue but to expand their impacts. Thus, a majority of the Fund's projects are impressively successful when measured against this most stringent criterion.

---

but there is some indication that as many as 36 percent of the reported sites may not have been influenced by a Fund-supported project. Despite this caveat, a large number of sites have adapted, replicated, or in some other way been influenced by the Fund's projects. Therefore it appears that the impact of the Fund's projects is significantly more far reaching than the number of projects taken alone would suggest.

[12]The percent of projects simultaneously meeting all three criteria is less than the percent of projects meeting only Criterion 1 (78 percent), Criterion 2 (73 percent) or Criterion 3 (71 percent).

Conclusion

Examination of the impacts of the Fund's projects provides answers to each of the four questions addressed in this paper:

1. Were the projects innovative?

   - Over three-quarters of the projects were innovative.

2. Did the projects affect their host institutions?

   - Almost three-quarters of the Fund's projects contributed significantly to improving the climate for innovation within their institution;
   - Over 50 percent caused significant changes in the operation of their host institution;
   - Twenty-five percent changed the mission of their institution.

3. Did the Fund's project's influence other organizations?

   - Dissemination activities of the Fund's projects have been extensive;
   - Significant numbers of sites have been extensively influenced by the Fund's projects.

4. Were the project activities able to become institutionalized after Federal support was withdrawn?

   - Of the Fund's projects which are completed or are nearing completion and which were not designed to terminate after accomplishing a discrete task, 70 percent meet the necessary criteria to be considered institutionalized.

Overall, the Fund supports innovative projects which result in far-reaching and continuing impacts. This important finding regarding the effects of the Fund's projects clearly suggests that the Fund is highly successful as a change agent.

References

1. Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M., Federal programs supporting change (Volume 7). Los Angeles: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

2. Bunting, C., Fund for the Improvement for Postsecondary Education, American Education, June 1975.

3. Pelavin, S., et al., An evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Volume II). Durham, N. C.: NTS Research Corporation, 1980.

4. An evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Volume I). Durham, N. C.: NTS Research Corporation, 1979.

Appendix A

Selected Questions from the Survey of Grantees and Corresponding Response Frequencies

42. Did your project result in any of the following:

.
.
.

Changed the Organization's Mission

	N	%
Missing	16	-
Yes	108	25.0
No	319	75.0

51. Did your project contribute significantly to improving the climate for acceptance of innovation within your organization?

	N	%
Missing	19	-
Yes	280	66.0
No	104	25.0
Uncertain	40	9.0

52. Did your project lead to any significant changes in the operations of your host institution or organization?

	N	%
Missing	16	-
Yes	218	51.0
No	182	43.0
Unclear	27	6.0

52A. Did these changes go beyond the scope of the original FIPSE-funded project?

	N	%
Skip	209	-
Missing	23	-
Yes	146	69.0
No	65	31.0

53. Did the existence of your project lead to any impact beyond the operations of your host institution?

	N	%
Missing	12	-
Yes	302	70.0
No	81	19.0
Uncertain	48	11.0

54. Did your project engage in any dissemination activities?

	N	%
Missing	8	-
Yes	376	86.0
No	58	13.0
Uncertain	1	.2

NTS Paper Presentations at AERA 1980

"A New Model for Federal Change Agent Programs", Sol H. Pelavin*

22.14/Table 4 (Individually Scheduled Papers Division G, and Division A), Thursday Morning, 8:45-9:30, Civic Center (Room 200, 3rd Floor).

"An Empirical Comparison of Four Indicators of Test Speededness", Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.12/Effects from Bias, Test-Wiseness, Speededness and Guessing (Critique, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Assessing and Improving the Accuracy of Title I Evaluation with Grade-Appropriate Tests", Edward Moran, West Virginia Department of Education; Robert F. Baker* and Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.13/Methods of Program Evaluation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Dalton Room, 3rd Floor)

"Policy Implications Analysis", Michael Everett, Indiana University; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 23.20/Evaluation Potpourri (Critique, Division H), Thursday Morning, 10:45-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"An Application of Psychometric Procedures in the Non-Psychological Domain: Development of Dissemination System Scales Using Classical Test Theory and Rasch Scaling Techniques", Robert F. Baker*, Jolinda K. Decad*, Doren L. Madey*, and A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 24.19/Applications of Latent Trait Theory, Sequential Analysis and Multi Dimensional Scaling, (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Afterncon, 12:35-1:55, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor)

"Tuition Assistance and Income Neutrality in College Choice", William Shaut, State University of New York, Central Administration; Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 24.31/The Impact of Student Financial Aid on Postsecondary Education (Critique, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Thursday Afternoon, 12:25-1:55, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"Evaluating Title I Early Childhood Programs: Problems, the Applicability of Model C, and Several Evaluation Plans", Keith McNeil* and Emily A. Findlay*

Session: 26.05/Multiple Regression Analysis - Application and Interpretation (Symposium, SIG/Multiple Linear Regression), Thursday Afternoon, 4:05-6:05, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Discussant: Judy McNeil*

*NTS Employees

"Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status", Joseph F. Haenn*

"Developing Empirical Descriptions of Educational Linkage Agents", Doren L. Madey* and Robert F. Baker*

Session: 3.11/ Perspectives on Knowledge Utilization at the System, Organizational and Individual Levels (Critique, SIG/Research Utilization), Monday Afternoon, 4:05-5:35, Sheraton (Exeter, 3rd Floor).

"State Grants for Capacity Building in Dissemination", Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 5.18/Relating Research to Policy on Dissemination Symposium, Division A), Tuesday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor).

"Effects of Magnet School Enrollment Changes on Desegregation", John C. Larson, Montgomery County Schools; Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 6.10/Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Desegregation (Paper Presentation, Division G), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Room 202, 3rd Floor).

"The Distributions of NCE, Percentile and Grade Equivalent Scores Among Twelve Nationally Standardized Achievement Tests", Thomas B. Williams*

Session: 6.12/Achievement Testing: Methodological Issues (Critique, Division H), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"History and Development of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Jan Shefter*, Diane Pelavin*, and Martin Orland*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Comprehensive Grant Program", Becky Jon Hayward*, Dan Johnston* and Diane Pelavin*

"An Analysis of the Achievements and Impacts of the Fund's Projects", Diane Pelavin*, Dan Johnston* and Jan Shefter*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Managemet Strategy", Martin Orland*, Becky Jon Hayward* and Jan Shefter*

"Hypotheses About the Successes of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Sol H. Pelavin*, Martin Orland* and Becky Jon Hayward*

Session: 17.22/A Study of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Symposium, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Wednesday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor).

*NTS Employees

"Reasons Why Testing and Evaluations Don't Inform", Joseph F. Haenn*

Session: 28.19/SEA and LEA Strategies to Use Testing and Evaluation Information for Local School Improvement (Symposium, Division H), Friday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Critic: Robert J. Goettel*

"The Regression Route to Reliability Coefficients", Bob Burton, Applied Management Sciences; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 30.13/Test Reliability (Critique, Division D), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"What is Educational Significance?", Michael B. Bunch*

Session: 30.20/Evaluation Research: Impact on Policy (Critique, Division H), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"Toward a Conceptual Framework for Understanding State and Local Implementation of Federal Aid Programs in Education", Martin E. Orland* and Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 30.22/Implementing Organizational Change (Paper Presentation, Division A), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor)

"Test Item Development: An Empirical Study of Practical Problems", Nick Maruhnich* and Thomas Dunning*

Session: 32.09/Issues in Test Construction and Interpretation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Identification of Oral Communication Skills in Children and an Analysis of Developmental Differences in Performance", Jolinda K. Decad*

Session: 32.18/Oral Reading and Oral Communication in Children (Critique, Division C), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Civic Center (Hancock, 3rd Floor)

*NTS Employees

NTS RESEARCH CORPORATION

NTS Research Corporation is a private corporation specializing in research and development, policy analysis, test scoring services, and market and survey analysis for Federal, state and local agencies as well as business and industry. Founded in 1973, NTS is a rapidly growing and vital company that reflects the research and development community in which it exists. Located in Durham, North Carolina, near Duke University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, and the Research Triangle Park, a nationally renowned research center, NTS complements its own highly skilled professional staff with the services of both local and national experts.

NTS has over 90 staff organized into two major divisions, Social Science and Research Science, with seven operating centers, including Educational Research, Human Development, Health Studies, Operations Research and Data Processing, Statistical and Sampling Research, Market Research and Survey Operations, and Measurement and Data Management. Activities of these centers span the full range of contract research including program evaluation, technical assistance and training.

NTS corporate structure, management, personnel, and diverse resources contribute to the successful performance of all contracts. The strength and breadth of NTS corporate capability is represented by an experienced, highly qualified staff. In addition to advanced educational degrees, the staff possesses a range of technical and interpersonal skills as well as extensive experience in current social and educational issues. Through this staff, NTS combines rigorous scholarship with an active problem-solving orientation in its training, technical assistance, and research and development activities.

Below is a brief listing of some recent and continuing NTS contracts:

- Educational Policy Development Center for Educational Quality and Improvement.
  Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/Policy Development.
- Evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.
  Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Evaluation of State Dissemination Grants Program for Capacity Building.
  National Institute of Education.
- Evaluation of Urban Area Experience-Based Career Education Program.
  Office of Career Education, US Office of Education.
- Follow-Up Study of Patients Who Had I-131 and Other Diagnostic Procedures During Childhood.
  DHEW/FDA Bureau of Radiological Health.
- National Evaluation of Headstart Educational Services.
  Administration for Children, Youth and Families.
- Operation of the ESEA Title I Technical Assistance Center, HEW Region III.
  Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, US Office of Education.
- Delaware Item Pool Development.
  Delaware State Department of Public Instruction.
- Evaluation of the Comprehensive Project in Adult Functional Literacy Education.
  North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges.
- ESEA Title I Evaluation: District of Columbia.
  District of Columbia Public Schools.
- Educational Policy Development Center for Educational Quality and Improvement.
  Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education/Policy Development.